



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 August 2024

by Elaine Benson BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/24/3344566

102 Raleigh Road, Southall, Hounslow UB2 5TP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Ravinder Gandkheel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is 00921/102/P3.
 - The development proposed is retention of existing second rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and its effect on the living conditions of the adjoining occupiers at No 104 Raleigh Road (No 104), in terms of loss of outlook and sense of enclosure.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey terraced house with a longstanding extension at the rear (the existing extension). A conservatory extension has been attached to it and this is the subject of this appeal.
4. The proposal extends considerably into the rear garden, well beyond the extensions at neighbouring properties. The combined depth of the two extensions is far in excess of the depth of extensions permitted by the Council's Residential Extension Guidelines SPD (SPD). I have considered the use of lightweight materials in the construction of the conservatory, that it is set down from the eaves of the existing extension and that it is not full width. However, these factors do not reduce the harmful impact of the development on the host property or the wider area. I conclude that the conservatory extension appears disproportionate and incongruous and, in combination with the existing extension, dwarfs the host dwelling.
5. There are rear extensions of variable design which are visible in the vicinity, including some with two single-storey extensions, as referred to by the appellant. However, their presence does not justify allowing further incongruous development.

6. I turn now to the impact of the conservatory extension on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. It extends much further into the rear garden than both of the neighbouring extensions. As No 100 Raleigh Road has a rear conservatory of a similar depth to the existing extension at the appeal site, the impact on its occupiers of the additional depth of the conservatory extension would be limited.
7. However, No 104 has a shallower single-storey extension and the existing extension at No 102 already extends well beyond it. The proposal results in a significantly increased depth of development close to the shared boundary. It results in an unacceptable loss of outlook for the occupiers of No 104 and leads to a most imposing and harmful sense of enclosure. Thus, the proposed development harms the living conditions of the occupiers of No 104. I am not convinced by the appellant's evidence that the design of the structure at the rear of No 104 in any way reduces the harmful impacts I have identified.
8. Whilst it is noted that the current occupier of No 104 raises no objections to the appeal proposal, the occupation of the property will inevitably change over time. It is the impact of a proposal on existing and future occupiers that should be taken into account.
9. Having regard to the footprint of the appeal extension, I am satisfied that the remaining garden area is sufficient to meet the amenity space needs of the occupiers of the host property. Nonetheless, this does not outweigh the conclusions set out above.
10. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the proposal is contrary to the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 and the guidance within the SPD which, in summary and of relevance to this appeal, seek to encourage high quality development that does not harm the amenities of other residential occupiers. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

Elaine Benson

INSPECTOR